

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 and 70-95 are pending in the present application. Claims 34, 41, 43, 44, 70, 75-79, 93 and 94 stand rejected and Claims 35-40, 42, 45, 46, 71-74, 80 and 95 have been objected to. Claims 1-33 and 81-92 have been allowed. Claims 34, 45, 46, 70-72, 74, 79, 80, 93 and 95 have been amended herein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the present amendments and following remarks. The above amendments and following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and to render all claims at issue patentably distinct over the references cited.

Claims 70, 79 and 94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as alleged being anticipated by Australian Reference No. AU-B-36652/95. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Notwithstanding, independent Claim 70 has been amended to essentially include the objected to dependent Claim 95. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the instant rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 34 and 93 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith '232 and de Rosa et al. '276. Claim 41 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith '232, de Rosa et al. 027 and EPO '662. Additionally, Claims 43 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith '232, de Rosa et al. '276 and Sims. The Examiner has rejected Claim 75 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Australian '2/95 and EPO '662. Claim 76 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Australian '2/95.

Finally, Claims 77 and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Australian '2/95 and Sims. These rejections are respectfully traversed. The originally filed claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine these references as suggested by the Examiner. Furthermore, it appears that hindsight reasoning is being improperly used given the present invention as a template. It is noteworthy that various of the references of record teach away from the Examiner's incorrect assumptions regarding Claim 76 in the presently claimed combination.

Notwithstanding, objected to dependent Claim 42 has been essentially added to its base independent Claim 34, base independent Claim 34 has essentially been added to objected to dependent Claim 45, base Claim 34 has essentially been added to objected to dependent Claim 46, base Claim 70 has essentially been added to objected to dependent Claim 71, and base Claim 70 has essentially been added to dependent Claim 72.

In view of the instant amendments, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner pass the case to issue at his earliest convenience.

Dated: April 13, 2009

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MLF/cmg

Respectfully submitted

By: 

Monte L. Falcoff, Reg. No. 37,617